



**MEETING**

The regular meeting of the Hayward Planning Commission was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Chairperson Caveglia, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

**ROLL CALL**

Present: COMMISSIONERS Bogue, Halliday, Sacks, Thnay, Williams, Zermeño  
CHAIRPERSON Caveglia

Absent: COMMISSIONER

Staff Members Present: Anderly, Calame, Collins, Ehrental, Looney

General Public Present: Approximately 12

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment.

**AGENDA**

- 1. Review of Draft Environmental Report for Cannery Area Design Plan

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

- 1. Review of Draft Environmental Report for Cannery Area Design Plan

Senior Planner Calame summarized the Draft EIR report for the Cannery Area Design Plan. He indicated that this hearing provides opportunity for a formal comment period for the DEIR. He noted that the members of the Planning Commission could also make comments for inclusion in the Final EIR. He described the area and provided information on the Design Plan. He commented that the plan envisions a new neighborhood within an existing neighborhood. He described the sub-areas within the Plan. He discussed the alternatives to the proposed Plan and described the differences between the various alternatives. He introduced Jerry Haag, the urban planning consultant who prepared the Draft EIR.

Chairperson Caveglia noted that there would be no action taken by the Commission since it was just for the public and Commissioners to comment at this time.

Commissioner Halliday commented on the issue of electric and natural gas usage included in the report. She wondered if this is a new thing that will be seen in the future. She said she had not seen it before. She commented on the housing section, and how it will help Hayward

to meet their share of low-income housing needs.

Senior Planner Calame added that it certainly helps with increasing the total housing units available. The City will have housing potential in that area. Staff has already assumed housing in this area for the housing unit projections by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). He noted that Hayward is a job center so it should also provide a share of housing as well. The plan assumes rental housing as well as ownership housing.

Community and Economic Development Director Ehrental added that although ABAG has requirements to meet goals for affordable housing, there is no requirement that it be in every project. She commented that the City needs to develop more affordable housing but it does not have to be in this area specifically.

Commissioner Halliday asked what impact this project will have on this particular neighborhood.

Community and Economic Development Director Ehrental pointed to the Twin Bridges project, which brought new housing and upgrades to the area. She said that often other properties around them are upgraded as well.

Commissioner Halliday asked about the traffic analysis, which is described as having an insignificant impact, and wondered whether we were looking at the cumulative impact of traffic in the area.

Transportation/Development Manager Collins responded that the cumulative impacts were assessed based on the General Plan.

Commissioner Halliday then asked about the historical, cultural resources section. She commented that anything to mandate or encourage the commemorating of this area as an important industrial site should be encouraged. She then commented on the architectural style in the area, suggesting that the bungalow-style should be incorporated into the designs.

Senior Planner Calame mentioned that there would be some attempt to carry the architectural style in the area out further. In addition to the water tower, there will be other ways to commemorate or allude to the historic nature of the area. An example is Preservation Park, where the Plan hopes to build on what is already there. As opportunities arise, historic houses from other areas may be moved there.

Commissioner Halliday asked about retail in the area, since there is nothing in the report on retail except the "big box" concept.

Senior Planner Calame responded that the Plan envisions keeping commercial retail at a neighborhood scale. When asked about zoning, he commented that it might be possible to show exact locations. The area could have commercial in a neighborhood residential zone.

Commissioner Sacks asked about the Alternative Plans and the Flood Plains in the area.



---

Senior Planner Calame responded that the various Alternatives allow choices for the area. As to the flood plains, the overflow source is Sulphur Creek.

Commissioner Zermeño asked about buses and bike paths through the area.

Senior Planner Calame told him that there are not necessarily specific bike paths but the proposed parkways have a path through the middle. He added that staff would be working with AC Transit for most appropriate bus service through the area.

Commissioner Zermeño then asked whether it might be possible to take the brick buildings and put lofts into them. He was told that the plan designer and architects have concluded that this is a huge cavernous building and it may be difficult to make that kind of conversion. Other concerns were with the physical state of the building and "seismic" conditions so preservation was not carried forward as part of the concept.

Commissioner Williams asked about the mitigation for business and housing displacement. He was told that there is an adopted plan addressing displacement caused by Redevelopment Agency action.

Community and Economic Development Director Ehrental explained the difference between government and private displacement. When there is a private transaction involving only private parties, Redevelopment does not have the responsibility for the displacement. When the Agency does take an active role, the relocation plans and laws come into effect. The Agency always makes an effort to relocate in the area when possible.

Commissioner Williams asked whether there is anything provided for first right of refusal?

Community and Economic Development Director Ehrental explained that the Redevelopment Agency would try to bring anyone displaced back to the area or to an equivalent area. With private transactions there are no requirements. The City Redevelopment Agency would attempt to relocate those displaced as close to the original location as possible.

Commissioner Thnay said this is a great idea to change a less than desirable area. He liked the design concept. As to the specific projects, the major street to north is "A" Street. He asked if it would be possible later on to collect fees to clean up and landscape "A" Street. He expressed another concern regarding housing and jobs. He suggested increasing parking in the Amtrak area. There don't seem to be too many parking stalls. Perhaps the City planners should set aside some land for more parking in the area. "B" Street is the only nicely landscaped street in the area. With Amtrak and BART, a bike path might be practical. He discussed the multi-modal transit station that Union City is proposing. It might be practical in Hayward with two BART stations and Amtrak so close together. He suggested exploring the idea of a multi-modal transit plan. He liked the concept of the panhandle except for the width.

Parking on one side with bike lane will take out 14 feet. It could turn the street into a raceway.

Community and Economic Development Director Ehrental commented that the City limits are set at the curb along the north side of A Street. The County controls all development north of that. Proposals in the capital improvement budget to improve the "A" Street median strip.

Senior Planner Calame noted that housing is necessary to improve our jobs/housing balance. We are looking at the need for 2,800 additional housing units within the next seven years. As to more parking for Amtrak: this plan would reconfigure the parking lot and would have more parking for Amtrak. Presently half the lot is designed for the use of the Park. "C" Street is to be used as a connector and link between BART and Amtrak. The treatment and the streetscape along "C" Street might be the subject of further study.

Chairperson Caveglia opened the public hearing at 8:32 p.m.

Patrick R. McGill, Omaha, Nebraska, representing ConAgra Foods, encouraged members to consider alternatives to the plans and not recommend this to the City Council. He noted that the projected students throughout the project exceed the number for a school. As a landowner with an existing industrial use, ConAgra recognizes many use problems. Looking at this with the proposed residential, data for schools and parking are not in the plan. This creates a problem for the landowner. There is nothing in the EIR for the property owners who will be taking a hit between the existing land and the net usable land they would have once the plan is implemented. ConAgra will take a disproportionate hit from parks, etc. He suggested waiting to take further action until they have a chance to submit alternatives between now and June 25.

The goal of affordable housing is not supported by the data, since there is no indication that the housing will be affordable. He suggested that this final plan is not ready to achieve that. He said he understands that this is a program EIR. However, the Commission should consider whether all the information is available. He noted that the ConAgra property is subject to on-going industrial warehouse use, rather than just until 2001. He asked that Commissioners consider other alternatives with fairer impact, rather than such a disproportionate one, to other landowners in the area.

Commissioner Bogue asked about the undue burden on ConAgra and how this plan would affect them and would they be able to operate their on-going business.

Senior Planner Calame responded that if this is an area of impact that needs to be explored by the EIR, that can be done.

Sheila Junge, 22741 Souza Court said that as a member of the Redevelopment Area Committee, she knew the Committee was also concerned about saving the bungalows in the area. She noted that the park situation is not addressed adequately, the HARD goals versus the proposed development. The figures are not similar. There is a considerable difference in the amount of park space. The development figures assume a shared use at the Burbank School site. There is no evidence that the school might share. She noted that already there are 300 units of additional housing in the Burbank Neighborhood area. There is no additional park space to account for these numbers. A number of additional units along Grand Street are being



---

built or proposed. The EIR does not address these problems.

Commissioner Halliday asked about the present usage for Centennial and Cannery Parks. Ms. Jung responded that the Cannery Park is very heavily used. However, she was not that familiar with the usage of Centennial Park.

Senior Planner Calame commented that the proposed mitigation measure refers to other alternatives rather than just additional parkland. He suggested that Centennial Park is not used to its fullest so perhaps funding for improved access to the acreage might help. The proposed community center may also provide recreational facilities, which could be viewed as an equivalent mitigation.

Antonio Silvera, Myrtle Street, commended the City on developing the area. He would like to see a better link from BART to Amtrak. He did not like to see more traffic on Myrtle. Rather than taking out all the houses on Myrtle, he suggested taking out the useless lawn where the school is. He suggested going through the lawn at the Junior High rather than knock down the houses there. There should be more retail available within walking distance from the residential areas.

Chairperson Caveglia closed the public hearing at 8:50 p.m.

Chairperson Caveglia suggested that nothing would happen until the warehouses are dealt with. You can not build the housing until the school is in effect. The key component is the phasing out the warehouses.

Community and Economic Development Director Ehrental agreed that much of this could be done piecemeal. Although one warehouse is leased until 2010, they can reconfigure their access, depending on how development is staged. The southern end of the area may be available earliest.

Chairperson Caveglia commented that until a substantial number of houses committed to the site are built, the school won't be built.

Community and Economic Development Director Ehrental suggested that, for example, the Redevelopment Agency might issue bonds and then be repaid by the school district. There are a variety of ways to front the funding for the school.

Commissioner Sacks commented that the process is exciting, it is remarkable to think about what this area can become. However, the school and student population cannot be resolved at this meeting. Absence of schools is not a reason for denying the project. She reminded members that this is a program EIR, so the Commission must talk and think in generalities. This is a vision of the future. She liked the bike boulevard concept. If the brick building is

torn down, perhaps the bricks can be reused for another building in the area.

Commissioner Thnay thanked Mr. Silvera, and commented that this area needs more retail, at least a local grocery store. At this point, residents in this area have to drive out to stores. Something more localized for retail is needed for the immediate neighborhood. A multi-modal concept should include shuttles. We would like people not to drive but we do not have any alternatives to go with it. Perhaps a study is needed to decide if a shuttle is feasible and viable. Maybe the City should commission such a study.

Chairperson Caveglia indicated that part of this plan is to revitalize B Street, rather than create more new retail in the area.

Commissioner Bogue discussed his concern regarding Zoning Ordinance changes. If someone comes in with a better plan, which is more workable within the area and coming from without the area, we must be open to it. Don't ruin the walk-ability of the area. Don't overbuild the retail in the area. We may find the southernmost block might be more successful as office buildings. It would provide a good buffer with the denser buildings and protect the residential against the road noises.

Senior Planner Calame said he believes the plan reflects those concerns for adequate neighborhood commercial to support the housing. This does not necessarily detract from the downtown area. Recognizing both concerns suggests the need for neighborhood commercial. The Plan does not set limits on neighborhood commercial. We should not look at the plan as limiting. One of the alternatives shows the ground floor of office buildings to be commercial. He suggested that the Planned Development District would provide more latitude.

Commissioner Halliday expressed concern with housing at south end, and the live/work spaces at the north. Live/work might be better at the south end. She really liked the pedestrian path over the railroad tracks and the housing around it. The linear park is a nice design. She liked the small walkable blocks. Preservation Park is wonderful and could accommodate some retail near Amtrak and BART. A clearly defined connection between the two transit centers is needed. The B Street Streetcar connection is a great idea. It is a good layout. There should be neighborhood retail in the area although the zoning is residential.

Her concerns include that the cultural and historic section of the report be filled out a bit more. She liked the concept of using the bricks for another project. She would like to see the spirit of the cannery preserved in the area. Consider giving the housing a bungalow style. She recommended ground floor retail in any business building.

Commissioner Zermeño asked whether the zoning is flexible, and whether the plan is going back to the public again.

Senior Planner Calame said the deadline for written comments is on the Draft EIR is June 25<sup>th</sup>. Several weeks later the Final EIR will be released and the Planning Commission and the City Council will hold public hearings. Notice of this meeting was sent to all property owners as well as those who attended any previous meetings.



Commissioner Zermefio said he likes the new school, the community center, and Preservation Park. The cannery is a major part of the history of the area. He suggested something imaginative to maintain the cannery look, to remind us of the cannery in the area.

There was no action taken on this matter.

### ADDITIONAL MATTERS

3. Oral Report on Planning and Zoning Matters

Community and Economic Development Director Ehrental reminded the Commission of the upcoming tour of Pittsburgh Power Plant.

4. Commissioners' Announcements, Referrals

There were no Commissioner announcements.

The meeting was adjourned by Chairperson Caveglia at 9:20 p.m.

APPROVED:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ed Bogue, Secretary  
Planning Commission

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Edith Looney  
Commission Secretary